

### **REMARKS**

The applicants have carefully considered the office action of February 3, 2009. By way of this response, claims 1-30 have been amended. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the applicants request reconsideration of this application.

#### **Interview Summary**

The undersigned would like to thank Examiner Haoshian Shih for the telephonic interview conducted on March 9, 2009. The claim language of the present application was discussed in light of the cited prior art. In particular, the limitation "HCI position event" was discussed, but no specific agreement on the claim language was reached.

#### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Moyne et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,109,979) in view of Vogeley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,633,691). As amended, independent claim 1 recites a method including encoding a first human-computer interaction (HCI) signal with a first code corresponding to a first time and encoding a second HCI signal with a second code corresponding to a second time. Further, independent claim 1 recites that the first code and the second code differ to indicate a difference between the first time and the second time. The method recited in claim 1 enables a base component receiving transmissions to, for example, distinguish between times at which different received transmissions occurred and/or a sequence in which the transmissions originated.

Moyne et al. and Vogeley et al. independently and collectively fail to describe such a method. As stated in the office action, Moyne et al. does not describe HCI signals having different codes. *The Office action dated February 3, 2009*, page 3. Moreover, Vogeley et al. does not describe HCI signals encoded differently to indicate a difference between a first time and a second time. Rather, Vogeley et al. states that "different types of pulse code modulation...could be utilized such that the system is responsive to multiple stylus locations

or functions, e.g., erase, draw red, draw green, etc.” *Vogeley et al.*, column 7, lines 21-25. Pulse code modulating radiation signals using amplification circuitry to indicate multiple stylus locations or functions (as described by *Vogeley et al.*) does not include encoding first and second HCI signals differently to indicate a difference between a first time corresponding to the first HCI signal and a second time corresponding to the second HCI signal (as recited in independent claim 1).

In support of the rejection of independent claim 1, the office action cites the following portion of *Vogeley et al.*:

“[The] radiation is sequentially projected by the DMD pixel mirrors to the screen. The timing of the receipt of radiation at the stylus and the timing of the DMD pixels which have been energized, will indicate which of the pixels (in the sequential scan) or which blocks of pixels (in the binary scan) are responsible for the IR, thereby providing the pixel location of the stylus.”

*Vogeley et al.*, column 3, lines 55-60. From this excerpt, the office action then concludes that “the timing difference between the first position and the second position are considered.”

*The Office action dated February 3, 2009*, page 8.

However, this is a misinterpretation and/or mischaracterization of the foregoing excerpt of *Vogeley et al.* In contrast to the assertion of the office action, the system described by *Vogeley et al.* uses a timed sequence of pixel energizations in conjunction with a known time at which the stylus detects an energized pixel to determine a position of the stylus. *Vogeley et al.*, column 5, line 66 – column 6, line 15. That is, the system described by *Vogeley et al.* involves **matching times** (e.g., the time of receipt of radiation with the timed sequence of pixel energizations). On the contrary, the first and second codes of the method recited in independent claim 1 differ to indicate a difference between a first and second time.

Because both *Moyne et al.* and *Vogeley et al.* fail to describe or suggest a system in which HCI signals are encoded differently to indicate a difference between a first time and a

second time, no combination of these references can disclose or suggest a system in which HCI signals are encoded differently to indicate a difference between a first time and a second time. Accordingly, neither Moyne et al., Vogeley et al., nor any combination thereof, can render independent claim 1 unpatentable. Therefore, the §103 rejection of claim 1, along with the rejections of all claims dependent thereon must be withdrawn.

Similarly, independent claims 10, 17, and 24 recite a method of, or a device to encode a first HCI signal with a first code to correspond to a first time and to encode a second HCI signal with a second code to indicate a second time. Further, independent claims 11, 17, and 24 recite that the first code and the second code differ to indicate a difference between the first time and the second time. For at least the reasons stated above, neither Moyne et al., Vogeley et al., nor any combination thereof, can render independent claims 10, 17, or 24 unpatentable. Therefore, the §103 rejection of independent claims 10, 17, and 24, along with the rejections of all claims dependent thereon must be withdrawn.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the amount enclosed (if any) or any additional fees which may be required during the pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 50-2455.

Respectfully submitted,

HANLEY, FLIGHT & ZIMMERMAN, LLC  
150 South Wacker Drive, Suite 2100  
Chicago, Illinois 60606

April 3, 2009

/Daniel J. Glitto/

---

Daniel J. Glitto  
Registration No. 58,996  
Attorney for Applicant(s)